

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-25 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 11, 18, and 25 are currently amended. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-25 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 10-12, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0039545 to Nishizawa et al. (hereinafter “Nishizawa”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,039,807 to Spitz (hereinafter “Spitz”), and in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0078880 to Alley et al. (hereinafter “Alley”).

Claims 2, 3, 7, 16, 17, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishizawa, in view of Spitz, in view of Alley, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,146,500 to Hawkins et al. (hereinafter “Hawkins”).

Claims 4-6, 13-15, and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishizawa, in view of Spitz, in view of Alley, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,459 to Chang et al. (hereinafter “Chang”).

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishizawa, in view of Spitz, in view of Alley, in view of Hawkins, and in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0040431 to Kato et al. (hereinafter “Kato”).

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishizawa, in view of Spitz, in view of Alley, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,093,133 to Hopkins et al. (hereinafter “Hopkins”).

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishizawa, in view of Spitz, in view of Alley, in view of Hawkins, and in view of Chang.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-25 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Office Action

alleges that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Nishizawa, Spitz, Alley, Hawkins, Chang, Kato, and Hopkins.

Applicants, however, respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the evidence presented in the Office Action. In order to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness, three requirements must be satisfied: all limitations of a pending claim must be expressly or impliedly disclosed by prior art references; there must be a suggestion or motivation in the art for the ordinarily skilled artisan to combine the limitations; and there must be a reasonable expectation of success in making such a combination. (M.P.E.P. § 2143).

Applicants respectfully submit that Nishizawa, Spitz, Alley, Hawkins, Chang, Kato, and Hopkins, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-25.

For example, claim 1 recites the feature of “automatically creating an electronic record from data stored in a plurality of different database tables associated with a database transaction in response to an occurrence of a predetermined event.” The Office Action alleges that Nishizawa discloses creating an electronic record as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As recited in amended claim 1, the electronic record is automatically created from data stored in a plurality of different database tables associated with a database transaction. In contrast, Nishizawa discloses creating an XML file to include a hash value for an electronic file *f* being uploaded to a document management system. Nishizawa does not disclose creating the electronic file *f*, the hash or summary value, or the XML file as recited in claim 1.

Nishizawa shows in FIG. 4 that a user registers an electronic file *f* into the electronic management system of Nishizawa. (Nishizawa: FIG. 4, paragraph [0117]). Nishizawa does not disclose that the electronic file *f* is automatically created from data stored in a plurality of different database tables associated with a database transaction as recited in amended claim 1.

Additionally, Nishizawa merely discloses that a hash value is determined for the electronic file *f*. Nishizawa discloses that the hash value or summary value is a value, which is substantially different from a record as recited in claim 1. Moreover, the hash value in Nishizawa is computed from electronic file *f*, and thus Nishizawa does not teach or suggest automatically creating the hash value from data stored in a plurality of different database tables associated with a database transaction as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, Nishizawa discloses in FIG. 5, that a hash value obtaining function produces an XML document based on the hash value, information on other files, and an operational attribute. (Nishizawa: FIG. 5, paragraph [0118]). Nishizawa does not disclose that the hash value and the operational attribute are data stored in a plurality of different database tables associated with a database transaction as recited in amended claim 1. Moreover, Nishizawa does not teach or suggest that the information on other files is data stored in a plurality of different database tables associated with a database transaction as recited in amended claim 1.

Spitz and Alley fail to cure the above deficiencies of Nishizawa as neither disclose automatically creating an electronic record from data stored in a plurality of different database tables associated with a database transaction in response to an occurrence of a predetermined event as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Nishizawa, Spitz, and Alley, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose the feature recited in amended claim 1 of “automatically creating an electronic record from data stored in a plurality of different database tables associated with a database transaction in response to an occurrence of a predetermined event.” Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants further respectfully submit that Nishizawa, Spitz, and Alley, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose the feature recited in amended claim 1 of “if execution of the rule results in a determination that an electronic signature is required, marking the instance of the electronic record as unsigned and initiating a request to collect the required electronic signature prior to committing the database transaction the database.” Spitz does not disclose that a request to collect the required electronic signature is initiated prior to committing a database transaction to a database as recited in amended claim 1.

Nishizawa and Alley fail to cure the above deficiencies of Spitz as neither disclose if execution of the rule results in a determination that an electronic signature is required, marking the instance of the electronic record as unsigned and initiating a request to collect the required electronic signature prior to committing the database transaction the database as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Nishizawa, Spitz, and Alley, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose the feature recited in amended claim 1 of “if execution of the rule results in a determination that an electronic signature is required, marking the instance of the electronic record as unsigned and initiating a request to collect the required electronic signature prior to committing the database transaction the database.” Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is again allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 11, 18, and 25 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-10, 12-17, and 19-24 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 11, and 18 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the allowable subject matter. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
61232260 v1